



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,373	12/17/2001	Ziqiang Xu	11843/12	4783

7590 02/10/2005

Kenyon & Kenyon
Suite 600
333 W. San Carlos Street
San Jose, CA 95110

EXAMINER

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/025,373	XU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip C Lee	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parsonnet et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0138546 (hereinafter Parsonnet).

Art Unit: 2154

5. As per claim 1, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed comprising:
- a first computer system associated with a user (110, fig. 1; page 3, paragraph 40), the first computer system including a display unit to display a first window associated with the user request (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52; page 5, paragraphs 55 and 60), the first computer system further adapted to transmit a message associated with the user request (page 9, paragraph 96); and
- a second computer system associated with a service provider (150, fig. 1; page 3, paragraph 40); the second computer system including a display unit to display a second window associated with the user request (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52-page 5, paragraph 53), the second computer system further adapted to receive the message (page 9, paragraph 97) and display the message in the second window at the second computer system (page 6, paragraph 64).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parsonnet in view of Ozzie et al, U.S. Patent 6,640,241 (hereinafter Ozzie).

8. As per claim 2, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed including a first computer system associated with a user coupled to a second computer system associated with a service provider (fig. 1), a method of communication between the user and the service provider comprising:

providing a first window at the first computer system associated with a user request (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52; page 5, paragraph 60);

providing a second window at the second computer system associated with the user request (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52-page 5, paragraph 53);

transmitting a message associated with the user request from the first computer system to the second computer system (page 9, paragraph 97); and

displaying the message in the second window at the second computer system (page 6, paragraph 64).

9. Parsonnet did not teach detecting and displaying status information for the user request. Ozzie taught a similar system comprising:

detecting status information for the user request (col. 17, lines 31-35); and

displaying the status information in the second window at the second computer system (col. 17, lines 58-col. 18, lines 18).

Art Unit: 2154

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet and Ozzie because Ozzie's system of detecting and displaying status information for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's system by providing user with notification of the available service providers.

11. As per claim 3, Parsonnet and Ozzie taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2 above. Ozzie further taught wherein said status information includes one of online, offline, and active (col. 16, lines 64-66; col. 17, lines 31-35; col. 18, lines 6-11).

12. As per claim 4, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed comprising:
a central computer system (180, fig. 1) adapted to be coupled to a first computer system associated with a user (110, fig. 1) and to receive said user request from said first computer system (page 3, paragraph 40); said central computer system further adapted to be coupled to a plurality of second computer systems (150, 160, 170, fig. 1), each associated with a service provider (fig. 1; page 4, paragraph 44);
wherein said first and second computer are adapted to display first and second windows, respectively, associated with the user request (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52; page 5, paragraph 55; page 6, paragraph 64).

13. Parsonnet did not teach detecting and displaying status information for the user request. Ozzie taught a similar system comprising:

a server adapted to detect status information for the user request and display said status information in said first and second windows (col. 17, line 58-col. 18, lines 18).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet and Ozzie because Ozzie's system of detecting and displaying status information for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's system by providing user with notification of the available service providers.

15. As per claim 5, Parsonnet and Ozzie taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Parsonnet further taught wherein said first and second computer systems are adapted to display messages associated with said user request in said first and second windows, respectively (page 5, paragraph 55; page 6, paragraph 64).

16. As per claim 6, Parsonnet and Ozzie taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 5 above. Parsonnet further taught wherein one of said second computer system is associated with a owner business manager and is adapted to control which of said messages are displayed on each of said second computer systems (page 5, paragraph 58; page 9, paragraph 97).

17. As per claim 7, Parsonnet and Ozzie taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6 above. Parsonnet further taught wherein control of which of said messages are displayed

on each of said computer systems is based on a set of business rules (page 8, paragraph 81; page 9, paragraph 97).

18. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parsonnet and Ozzie in view of Cogger et al, U.S. Patent 6,032,184 (hereinafter Cogger).

19. As per claim 8, Parsonnet and Ozzie taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Parsonnet and Ozzie did not teach the status information for the user request comprises a request state. Cogger taught wherein status information for said user request comprises a request state and said request state is one of opened/not assigned, assigned/not resolved, and resolved (col. 2, lines 27-33; col. 4, lines 15-26; col. 16, line 64-col. 17, line 15).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of including the request state for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by allowing a user to identify the status of all trouble tickets pertaining to his organization (col. 2, lines 42-46).

21. As per claim 9, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 8 above. Cogger further taught wherein said request status changes from assigned/ not resolved to resolved when a proposed answer from one of the service providers is accepted by the user (col. 15, lines 34-38; col. 16, lines 42-54).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of including the request state for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by allowing a user to identify the status of all trouble tickets pertaining to his organization (col. 2, lines 42-46).

23. As per claim 10, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed comprising:
transmitting a user request from a first computer system associated with a user to a central computer system (page 9, paragraph 96);
selecting said user request via a second computer system associated with a service provider (page 9, paragraphs 97 and 98); and
providing a display window at each of said first and second computers (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52-page 5, paragraph 53; page 5, paragraph 60).

24. Parsonnet did not teach displaying status information for the user request. Ozzie taught a similar system comprising:
displaying the status information in the display windows (col. 17, lines 58-col. 18, lines 18).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet and Ozzie because Ozzie's system of detecting

and displaying status information for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's system by providing user with notification of the available service providers.

26. Parsonnet and Ozzie did not teach assigning status information to the user request.

Cogger taught a similar system comprising:

assigning status information to the user request (col. 2, lines 27-33; col. 4, lines 15-26; col. 16, line 64-col. 17, line 15).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of including the request state for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by allowing a user to identify the status of all trouble tickets pertaining to his organization (col. 2, lines 42-46).

28. As per claim 11, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10 above. Parsonnet further taught wherein said selecting step further comprises:

displaying said user request at said second computer system (page 6, paragraph 64); and displaying competitive offers for service of said user request (page 1, paragraph 3) .

29. As per claim 12, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10 above. Parsonnet and Cogger further taught comprises:

displaying said user request at said second computer system (see Parsonnet, page 6, paragraph 64); and
displaying a user priority for said user request (see Cogger, fig. 7; col. 13, lines 56-63; col. 15, lines 57-63).

30. As per claim 13, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed comprising:
transmitting a user request from a first computer system associated with a user to a central computer system (page 9, paragraph 96);
providing said user request to plurality of second computer systems, each associated with a service provider (page 9, paragraph 97);
providing offers for service of said user request to the first computer system (page 1, paragraph 3); and
displaying said offers at said first computer system (page 1, paragraph 3).

31. Parsonnet did not teach displaying status information for the user request. Ozzie taught a similar system comprising:

displaying the status information for the user request (col. 17, lines 58-col. 18, lines 18).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet and Ozzie because Ozzie's system of detecting and displaying status information for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's system by providing user with notification of the available service providers.

33. Parsonnet and Ozzie did not teach assigning status information to the user request.

Cogger taught a similar system comprising:

assigning status information to the user request (col. 2, lines 27-33; col. 4, lines 15-26;
col. 16, line 64-col. 17, line 15).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of including the request state for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by allowing a user to identify the status of all trouble tickets pertaining to his organization (col. 2, lines 42-46).

35. As per claim 14, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13 above. Parsonnet further taught comprising:

displaying rating information for service providers associated with said offers at said first computer system (page 1, paragraph 3); and
selecting one of said offers at said first computer system (page 1, paragraph 3).

36. As per claim 15, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 14 above. Parsonnet and Ozzie further taught comprising:

displaying presence information for service providers associated with said offers at said first computer system (see Ozzie, col. 17, line 58-col. 18, line 18); and

selecting one of said offers at said first computer system (see Parsonnet, page 1, paragraph 3).

37. As per claim 16, Parsonnet taught the invention as claimed comprising:
- transmitting a user request from a first computer system associated with a user to a central computer system (page 9, paragraph 96);
 - selecting said user request via a second computer system associated with a primary service provider (page 9, paragraphs 97 and 98); and
 - providing a display window at each of said first and second computers (e.g. browser) (page 4, paragraph 52-page 5, paragraph 53; page 5, paragraph 60), wherein said first and second compute systems are adapted to display messages associated with said user request (page 5, paragraph 55; page 6, paragraph 64).
38. Parsonnet did not teach displaying status information for the user request. Ozzie taught a similar system comprising:
- displaying the status information in the display windows (col. 17, lines 58-col. 18, lines 18).
39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet and Ozzie because Ozzie's system of detecting and displaying status information for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's system by providing user with notification of the available service providers.

40. Parsonnet and Ozzie did not teach assigning status information to the user request.

Cogger taught a similar system comprising:

assigning status information to the user request (col. 2, lines 27-33; col. 4, lines 15-26; col. 16, line 64-col. 17, line 15).

transmitting a collaboration request from said second computer system to a third computer system associated with a secondary service provider and accepting said collaboration request at said third computer system (col. 15, line 64-col. 16, line 54).

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of including the request state for the user request would increase the user alertness of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by allowing a user to identify the status of all trouble tickets pertaining to his organization (col. 2, lines 42-46).

42. As per claim 17, Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 16 above. Cogger further taught wherein on said primary and secondary service providers has ownership of said user request, the method further comprising:

transferring ownership of said user request between said primary and secondary service providers (col. 15, line 64-col. 16, line 54).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Parsonnet, Ozzie and Cogger because Cogger's teaching of transferring ownership of said user request between service provider would increase the efficiency of Parsonnet's and Ozzie's systems by providing an all inclusive service request contact point that a user may submit all service inquiries to a single location without regard to the location of the network event within the network (col. 16, lines 31-38).

CONCLUSION

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Vitale et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0254757, disclosed a system for a user to order services from a service provider.

Yoza et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0133616, disclosed a system for service provider to provide services to a user.


Carolan et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0049737, disclosed a system for allowing a user to select a service provider from a plurality of service providers.

45. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or

Art Unit: 2154

earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)350-6121.

P.L.


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100